

## **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

In response to the Examiner's further Office Action of August 28, 2008 issued with respect to the present RCE application, the Applicant respectfully submits the accompanying Amendment of claims and the below Remarks.

### ***Regarding Amendment***

In the Amendment:

independent claim 1 is amended to specify that the claimed method is carried out in an integrated circuit, each request can be one of a CPU memory write request from a CPU requester, a non-CPU memory write request from a non-CPU requester and a non-CPU memory read request from a non-CPU requester, the non-CPU write request has the highest latency, the access requests are received in a timeslot arbitrator of the integrated circuit, the timeslot arbitrator maintains the timeslot list and pointers, the access request in step (c) is a non-CPU write request;

dependent claim 2 is unchanged;

dependent claim 3 is amended to specify that the CPU write request has the lowest latency and step (c) includes the timeslot arbitrator arbitrating in the timeslot list CPU write requests to be interleaved with non-CPU write and read requests;

dependent claim 5 is amended to conform with amended claim 1;

independent claim 6 is amended similar to claim 1; and

dependent claims 7 and 9 are amended similar to claims 3 and 5.

.

It is respectfully submitted that the Amendment does not add any new matter to the present application because support for these amendments can be found in the original system claims 6-9 and at paragraphs [2169]-[2174], [2200]-[2225] and [2283]-[2320] of US Application Publication No. 2005/0177633 of the present application.

### ***Regarding 35 USC 101 Rejections***

It is respectfully submitted that the amendments of independent claim 1 ties the method claims to another category of statutory subject matter.

### ***Regarding 35 USC 112, first and second paragraph Rejections***

It is respectfully submitted that the amendments of independent claims 1 and 6 limit the claim language to the embodiment described at paragraphs [2169]-[2174], [2200]-[2225] and [2283]-[2320] of US Application Publication No. 2005/0177633 of the present application, and therefore no new matter is recited in independent claims 1 and 6, and claims 2-5, 7 and 9 dependent therefrom.

### ***Regarding 35 USC 103(a) Rejections***

It is respectfully submitted that the subject matter of amended independent claims 1 and 6, and claims 2-5, 7 and 9 dependent therefrom, is not taught or suggested by Stacovsky, Radke, NPL1 and NPL2 either taken alone or in combination with one another, because none of these cited references teach or suggest arbitrating CPU memory write requests and non-CPU memory write and read requests in the manner required by the claimed invention.

It is respectfully submitted that all of the Examiner's rejections have been traversed. Accordingly, it is submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance and reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested.

Very respectfully,

Applicant/s:



---

Richard Thomas Plunkett

C/o:

Silverbrook Research Pty Ltd  
393 Darling Street  
Balmain NSW 2041, Australia

Email:

kia.silverbrook@silverbrookresearch.com

Telephone:

+612 9818 6633

Facsimile:

+61 2 9555 7762